



CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A BI-WEEKLY JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN OPINION

Volume 1, No. 11

June 30, 1941

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

Allied Peace Aims

IN HIS Mansion House speech Anthony Eden mingled wisdom with something less than wisdom. There was justification for a dash of realism in his reference to Germany in the post-war world; for to suppose that a victorious Britain will conclude a peace which will not carefully guard against a repetition of German aggression is naive in the extreme. Worse than that, it is to overlook a plain material and moral requirement of the peace. It is just possible that Mr. Eden was addressing himself, on the one hand, to what the British government fears is a dangerous sentimentalism at home and, on the other hand, to the manifest tendency in France to accept Germany hegemony in Europe.

Be this as it may, Mr. Eden's declaration is disappointing. Not because he gave no blueprint for reconstruction—no one can do that, but because of his broad intimation that the old concept of exclusive German guilt is being officially revived to furnish a rationale for an anticipated settlement. Five times in a century, he says, Germany has violated the peace. Thus Hitler, whose emergence has been pictured as something so horrendous as to array the civilized world against him is assimilated to German history. This is particularly regrettable because Mr. Eden's speech contains so much that is commendable and might otherwise have been reassuring. There are many people in Britain, particularly in the ranks of labor and the Church who fully understand that a British victory has its own perils, however devoutly it is hoped for and however preferable it is to a German victory. To judge by the applause which Mr. Eden's thrust received—greater, we are told, than any other part of his address—a mood is developing under the pressure of war which proves how real the anticipated peril is. One shudders to think, moreover, of the use which German propaganda will make of this and similar utterances by Allied statesmen, since it has long been apparent that only the fear of destruction keeps many strong anti-Nazi Germans loyal to Hitler.

It would be unfair to assume that Mr. Eden was consciously echoing Duff-Cooper's demand that Brit-

ain be not "fooled again" by a hypocritical German nation. But what he said about Germany was ill-designed to keep alive the consciousness, so gratifyingly evident in other British utterances, of common responsibility for the international anarchy which led to this war. As victory approaches vindictiveness is likely to be harder to smother. If this word of Mr. Eden can be said in the green tree what will be said in the dry?

The matter comes down to this: the recognition of the necessity of guaranteeing Europe against a revival of Hitlerism should have been accompanied by a much more specific elaboration of the constructive intentions of the Government toward the whole of Europe and the world. Mr. Eden said not a word about the abandonment of the principle of unlimited national sovereignty and the creation of a truly international government. He said nothing about the necessity of fundamental economic reconstruction such as the pronouncements of the Labor Party and of British churchmen have clearly implied. There is no hint—or at most, no more than a hint—of the requirement that the victors shall impose limitations upon themselves corresponding to those which are to be imposed on Germany.

This criticism has no relation to the uncritical demand so often repeated that Britain should tell the world what she is going to do about India, or precisely how she will move to correct her failure to find a constructive solution of the problems of the Empire in the Near East. All such demands overlook the requirements of a war strategy where an avaricious and conscienceless dictator is ready to take immediate advantage of every promise of a revision of national policy. What was lacking in the Eden speech was a clear statement of Britain's intention to participate in the creation of a truly new order in which justice and security will not depend on mere restraint in the use of power but on a mutual abandonment of the political and military instruments of power. It is a first principle of democracy, reinforced by Christian insights, that power itself engenders the will to power, that political justice and

security have only a precarious foundation so long as the exercise of power is unilateral.

All this is immensely important for America at this moment. The commendable efforts of our political realists to convince the nation of the necessity and wisdom of full British-American cooperation, and of the consistency of such a policy with our whole history, have in them an element of serious danger. It is one thing to use the combined might of our two nations to preserve "freedom of the seas," but quite another thing for these nations to claim the role of permanent keepers of the world's peace. Facile assumptions that Germany is by permanent nature a potential bad "master" lead directly to the conclusion that peace must be maintained by an arsenal of democracy in the keeping of other governments. An Anglo-American peace will not be a real peace. There is at this moment grave danger that the gradual overcoming of American isolationism may have an unwholesome sequel. It is said that the A. E. F. returned from Europe with a strong conviction that the peace should have been made in Berlin. It would take little encouragement from Britain to give impetus to a boisterous demand in America that "this time" no half-way job shall be done.

It may indeed be argued that in failing to make any distinction between Hitler and the historic German nation Mr. Eden is more realistic than Mr. Roosevelt, who never fails to make it. There is a surprising degree of continuity in the foreign policy of a nation regardless of what group administers it. But the inference drawn from this fact is precisely the point at issue. A nation's foreign policy is formulated and carried out within a complex of international relationships and it is not likely to undergo radical and permanent change except in response to a change in the system of which it is a part. The counterpart of this truth in personal relations is one of the basic assumptions of Christianity. This is the meaning of redemption. If a Christian justifies war it is because he recognizes no permanent limits upon this redemptive principle: he believes that while criminality on a national scale must be met with stern justice, it can and must be followed by a regime in which every nation concerned shall participate, as of right, in the creation and maintenance of a juster peace.

Perhaps the admirable, but rather cryptic, portions of Mr. Eden's address concerning political and economic cooperation in the post-war world imply that he did not mean what has been inferred from his remarks about the restraints to be imposed on Germany. If so, his statement should be clarified without delay.

Critical Loyalty

THREE are those who are afraid that an attitude of critical loyalty toward a cause is inadvisable, because it plays into the hands of the critics of the cause. On the other hand, uncritical loyalty to the democratic cause strengthens, by seeming to justify, the illusions of those critics who insist that commitment to a cause invariably means that the weaknesses of the position one supports, are condoned. Men must make decisions between good and evil in history; but Christians, above all people, ought to know that there is evil in their good. This knowledge will tempt them to inaction only if they are seeking the illusory sinless position in history. But their contrite recognition of the perils to justice in their own position must also bring forth fruits meet for repentance.

This position, founded in the Christian interpretation of life and history, happens also to be good politics. We can neither afford to allow the German tyranny to triumph over us, nor can we allow our triumph over it to result in a new anarchy of the nations. To avert its triumph is the more immediate and pressing task; and since many of our countrymen are not yet committed to it, we are bound to emphasize the point. But the task of building a genuinely democratic world order, though not as immediate, is no less important. The second task cannot be accomplished without the first. But the first might be accomplished without the second. If it were, our civilization would surely perish.

The Russian Venture

THE most fantastic chapter in this fantastic war has opened with the invasion of Russia from the Baltic to the Black Sea. It will be days, and perhaps weeks, before we know whether the Russian military forces are as weak as Russian policy would seem to have indicated, or as strong as all the comrades and fellow travellers have claimed. Probably Russia is no match for Hitler's mechanized army and will not be strong enough to prevent very great initial successes by the German army. The new venture may therefore give Hitler the grain and oil which he needs for a long war and thereby increase the peril of a possible complete Nazi triumph. This, together with some unfavorable effects upon our domestic situation, where appeasement sentiment in certain Catholic and big business groups will probably be increased, must prompt American opponents of Nazi tyranny to redoubled efforts.

On the other hand the Russian venture supplies us with some rather grim reassurances of Hitler's ultimate defeat. It proves that he has given up hope of

a quick triumph over Britain. It prompts the hope that initial successes may be followed by ultimate failure and that this is the point where this dictator overstepped the bounds of the possible, as Napoleon did before him, a point to which all dictators are finally driven by their megalomania. It proves the futility of a policy of appeasement and collaboration with Hitler and may have a wholesome effect upon those apostles of a negotiated peace who are still

capable of a reasoned analysis of common experience. It will bring those labor troubles which were inspired by communist conspiracy to an end. We can accept this by-product of the new development with satisfaction, however much we may smile at the tortuous logic by which the comrades will have to justify their reinterpretation of the war. This is no time to relax efforts toward a united opposition against Nazism; but neither is there cause for despair.

War and Peace Aims and the Church's Task

WILLIAM PATON*

THE Minister for Economic Warfare stated in public some time ago that an announcement of national "war aims" on the part of the Government might be expected shortly, either by a communication to the Press or in a speech by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister later indicated that in his judgment the time was not yet at hand when such a declaration could be made with advantage. It is not difficult to deduce how matters stand. We may assume that a great deal of work has been done in official, as in unofficial, circles upon the subject. We cannot complain that a right opportunity should be sought for a pronouncement which must needs be momentous. In any case an official statement, whenever made and however admirable, does not relieve private citizens from the duty of forming their own judgment.

A Government statement is necessarily conservative, because it is made by those who have to translate their proposals into act. It may well be supplemented by the contribution of those who, not bearing so great responsibilities, are free to scout ahead, as it were, testing and criticising ideas and informing the public mind. In this task Christians have an obvious duty to share. The Church—or the Churches—are limited in their official capacity to the enunciation of moral principles which command the assent of all Christians; but in the wide field of discussion where difference of Christian judgment is easily possible, the Christian individual or group not only may, but must, try to bring to bear upon the complex practical problems by which we are faced the insights of Christian faith. The effect of these insights may be in the main negative rather than positive, but none the less important.

*This article by Dr. William Paton, Secretary of the World Council of Churches and British Secretary of the International Missionary Council, is reprinted from the *Christian News Letter* because it is a good example of the best type of Christian thought in Britain on the problem of peace aims. Dr. Paton is a member of several groups dealing with this issue.

To the reasons which have been advanced in favour of some official pronouncement I would add two others, which I have scarcely seen mentioned. The first is the blockade and its effect upon Continental countries; the second is the importance of the American attitude.

It is our hope that the blockaded peoples, lately allies and still, we trust, friends, will realize that their freedom depends upon the defeat of Nazism and that what is necessary to that defeat must be endured. But we should be foolish not to recognize that there are powerful forces working the other way. Blockade is a terrible weapon and its effects in the long run are terrible. Public discussion in these countries is subject to Nazi control, and Nazi propaganda will be addressed to minds rendered more susceptible to it by the blockade. Britain is not so popular on the Continent that it will be sufficient to show that the sufferings entailed by a blockade are necessary for a British victory or British interests; it must be clear that what these peoples have to suffer is for the sake of their own freedom. Those who have had to submit for months to Nazi rule may become subtly habituated to it and reconciled to its apparent inevitability. This may show itself in a mood of resignation to the much advertised "new order" in Europe. It is widely recognized that a mere return to national sovereignties will not solve Europe's problems, and it is not hard to understand that the less courageous and clear-sighted may incline to accept the only kind of European order which circumstances appear to make possible.

There are strong reasons for indicating, at least in broad outline, what is the nature of the European (or even of the world) order that we should wish to see set up, and to which we should wish to contribute by effort and if necessary by sacrifice. It is not, of course, a question of imposing an order on unwilling peoples. What others will welcome is that we should make clear where our sympathies lie, what sort of plans commend themselves to us in the light of the

lessons of the war, and where our weight is to be thrown.

The other factor to be borne in mind is the United States. It is of the highest importance, as I tried to argue in an earlier Supplement, that thoughtful minds in America should be convinced that there are objectives of supreme moment to the well-being of the world, which can only be attained by the common action of the United States and ourselves. I am not thinking here of belligerent action, on which it is inexpedient for British persons to offer an opinion. The United States are now deeply moved to aid us in our defence; but it would be blind optimism to suppose that they are equally sympathetic to all aspects of British policy. There is in the United States, along with its generous sympathies, a strong strain of suspicion of British policies. As soon as they pass beyond the stage of aiding us in our defence to contemplate sharing with us in the establishment of some order in Europe and beyond, they will begin to ask questions. The old questions—India, British imperialism, British hegemony—will raise their heads. It would be unwise to forget that this will certainly happen.

Outside the British Commonwealth there is no nation which cherishes what may be called liberal ideas, and at the same time possesses power, except the United States. A clear statement which held the assent of responsible people in both countries might be of far-reaching significance. If a union of aim and objective between ourselves and the United States cannot be brought about, there is little prospect of improving the international situation.

Principle

In regard to these questions Christians have to act in two distinct spheres. There are practical measures to be taken in the political and economic realm; and there are the distinctive duties which belong to the Church as such. In the first group, again, it is necessary to distinguish between the permanent arrangements which will ultimately form the basis of a better world order and the immediate needs which will have to be faced upon the cessation of war.

The broad principles on which a Christian judgment on questions of practical policy should be based, as has been shown by representative groups and gatherings in recent years, meet with wide acceptance. At a small but influential gathering held at Geneva just before the war broke out, and attended by German, Dutch, Swiss, French, Scandinavian, Russian, Hungarian and Oriental delegates as well as by British and American, there was complete agreement to a statement which would not have passed unchallenged at the Oxford Conference of 1937. This statement, of which the sponsor was Professor Emil Brunner, was to the effect that "the Gospel contains

directions for life and for the mutual relations that should exist between states and nations, which every Christian ought to know and obey." Among these "basic principles" were included:

the equal dignity of all men,
respect for human life,
acknowledgment of the solidarity for good and evil
of all nations and races of the earth,
respect for the plighted word,
the recognition that power of any kind, political or
economic, must be co-extensive with responsibility.

To those who are familiar with the struggles of Continental theologians on this subject it will not seem unimportant that on the eve of war Lutherans and Reformed were in agreement that *there are rules for states which are deducible from the Gospel*.

There was recently published in *The Times* a letter signed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, Cardinal Hinsley and the Moderator of the Federal Free Church Council in which were recorded, as matters on which the four signatories were unanimous, the five points promulgated a year ago by the Pope and five other points arrived at by the Oxford Conference of 1937. The first five may be very briefly summarised as follows:

the right of every nation to life and independence,
general and agreed reduction of armament,
an international body to maintain and, if necessary,
revise the international order,
protection of the rights of minorities,
the submission of human statutes to the sacred and
inviolable standards of the laws of God.

To these Papal points the British leaders added five "standards by which economic situations and proposals may be tested," these being domestic rather than international in their bearing:

the abolition of extreme inequalities in wealth,
equal opportunities for education and advancement
for every child,
safeguarding of the family as a social unit,
restoration of the sense of divine vocation in men's
daily work,
fair distribution of the riches of the earth to all.

These statements, carefully examined, register a surprising amount of agreement on certain points which are of great importance—(a) the solidarity of mankind and the need to frame political institutions which reflect this; (b) the emptiness of mere political formalities if divorced from social and economic considerations; (c) a tendency to think more of basic human rights than of systems such as "democracy."

By such standards a mere return to the *status quo*

ante bellum is condemned. The problem is seen to be one of advancing the reign of law, of combining the extension of social and international controls with the growth of liberty. It is becoming more and more apparent that this is at bottom a moral and religious question. Emphasis on individual rights has to be tempered by dedication; the power of the mass organization, political or economic, will inevitably become a tyranny unless it is itself subordinate—and to what else but God?

Action

When we consider what is needed in the realm of action, if such principles as these are to be obeyed, we face, first, the necessity for such a definite victory over the Axis powers, and in particular over Germany, as shall ensure the possibility of their being considered. I imagine that those who oppose the further elaboration of our national aims do so because they feel that certain objectives are both so clear in their necessity and so considerable in their magnitude that it is needless now to go further. Among such necessary objectives are the evacuation of the conquered and occupied territories, the ending of the rule of Hitler and the Nazi leaders (one should add also that of Mussolini and his Fascists, save that they, prior in time, are now a derivative problem), the ending of all that tyranny which is represented by the Gestapo and the Nuremberg decrees.

But it has already been argued that to say this leaves unanswered questions that are not distant but immediate. What kind of order in Europe and the world do we want to arise, and if the principles set forth above are to be our guide, how can the transition be made from one order of things to another? It is in this problem of transition that the ordinary thoughtful man finds his main difficulties. A full-dress plan for federalism leaves many people unconvinced, because they cannot see how the move is to be made from one position to another entirely different, and they feel that abstract principles cannot thus be applied *simpliciter* to a very complicated situation, in which all sorts of national idiosyncrasies are involved. There is beginning to emerge, however, a line of thought which seems to be gaining increasing support among those most competent to form a judgment.

The underlying principle is to concentrate attention in the first instance upon the measures which are necessary in the immediate post-war period. Measures will obviously be needed for policing, for feeding, for the rationing of raw materials and for many tasks of reconstruction. The provisions for dealing with the immediate emergency can be planned in such a way that they will become the nucleus of a permanent organization of government. The transportation of food to hungry peoples, the mobilising of medical

services on an international scale, the remaking of the links between Europe and the producing countries so that the vast surpluses of raw material are placed at the service of a reconstructed European industry—these are only some of the tasks which will have to be faced and for which preparation must be made *now*. For their carrying out Anglo-American co-operation is an absolute prerequisite. They are, moreover, so central and vital that the measures taken to deal with them might, if well-devised, lay the foundation of a permanent order.

Economic provision is going to be more important and urgent than the devising of new political forms. Moreover, the necessities of economic life cut across the national boundaries of Europe and the rebuilding of Europe's life requires that economic realities (e.g., the natural provision and juxtaposition of raw materials and industries) should be followed irrespective of national frontiers.

I suggest that the key to the future may lie in the combination of this economic and social work of reconstruction with the promulgation of a basal charter of human rights. Obviously the task of reconstruction can be carried out only under the authority of those powers which dispose of unquestioned force, and it is here assumed that at the end of the war there would be such a preponderance of power in the hands of the British Commonwealth and the United States. Since the granting of economic assistance in the tasks of reconstruction provides a "sanction" as powerful as force, it would be possible to make full economic co-operation on an equal basis dependent upon acceptance of a fundamental charter of human rights. It is possible to gain a wider assent to such a charter than to forms of government such as "democracy."

The charter might include such rights and liberties as the following:

The restoration of civil and religious liberties; freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of research; freedom of association; freedom of religious worship; fair and open trial, equality before the law, and abolition of secret agencies of oppression.

These phrases may be too redolent of the life and ideas of the western democracies, and it may be necessary to translate them into terms that relate them more closely to the life of other peoples, such as the German. But the essential point is that since the control of a major part of the economic resources of the world is in fact vested in the British Commonwealth and the United States, these two powers should invite into full and equal co-operation with them those nations which accept the same basal human rights, and that the linking of the two things, access to raw materials and acceptance of human

rights, should dominate the relations of this group with other peoples.

It would be necessary that all those nations who thus band themselves together should consult one another and know exactly where they stand on the matter of common defence. The experience of the British Commonwealth shows that, provided there is a certain basal community of ideals and understanding of life, theconcerting of defence measures is more important than formal political federation, which the Dominions have hitherto eschewed. The extent to which the problem will be merely one of policing, and the degree of disarmament possible, depend mainly if not entirely upon the kind of Germany with which ultimately peace is made—a collapsed Germany or one able to negotiate.

Special Problems

There will, of course, be a multitude of special problems that will require consideration. For example, the question of colonies. Here the primary consideration is not the satisfaction of the claims of European nations but the interests, welfare and development of the native populations. Again, there is the question of the Jews, which is not the concern of Jews alone, and which if left unsolved will leave a permanent source of instability in any international system. Another important question is that of religious and missionary freedom.

The Church's Task

In all such planning, so far as it can be affected by public discussion, it is plainly necessary that Christian men and women should make their contribution.

But there are distinctive tasks which must be performed by the Church itself.

This subject needs a Supplement to itself, and it is better only to indicate one main conviction within this sphere. Whether we are looking to the immediate future or further into the years ahead, the Church's greatest task is, under God, that of creating new life. There is likely to be in Europe a degree of chaos and bewilderment, of hate, revenge and despair such as may well appal us, if the war should last through the period of which leaders speak. Whence is to come that re-creating spirit of hope and life which mankind will so sorely need? The central, vital matter is that the Church should prove itself to be the Church, embracing in its unity all who believe in Christ—an oecumenical society transcending all differences of race and nationality. A fellowship of Christians across the national barriers could be a fountain of hope and life in the midst of chaos. This is no mere dream, for the bonds that have united Christians in the oecumenical movement have not been broken, and relations that have had to lapse through want of communications can be resumed. We know something of the spirit that has been shown in the dark days by Churches in Scandinavia, Holland and France. It may turn out that just as the East Enders of bombed London found a quality in their persons that they had not recognized before, so the power to which the Churches have access may shine more brightly in them through the adversity in which the nations are held. In that case the friendships and trust which the oecumenical movement enshrines may prove to be the God-given condition of action.

The World Church: News and Notes

Conscientious Objectors in Britain

The latest figures relating to conscientious objectors, who have appeared before the special tribunals set up by the British conscription act, reveal that up to January 53,000 claimed exemption according to law. This represents less than two per cent of the total conscripted. Local tribunals gave six per cent of these unconditional exemption; thirty-seven per cent were required to perform civilian defense of national importance, and thirty per cent were sent to non-combatant service in the army. Twenty-seven per cent failed to convince the tribunals of the sincerity of their scruples.

Of this twenty-seven per cent, many, of course, appealed to higher tribunals, which in some cases gave them a better rating. Of the 15,000 rejected only thirty-seven are in prison, as compared with 816 during the World War. Of the objectors who were sent into the army, there is one case of seven being beaten up at Liverpool. For this offense one officer and six non-commissioned officers were court-martialed. While no

law can be said to be ideal, the British law has certainly been revealed as infinitely superior to that which governed the matter in the World War.

Catechism of "Godbelievers"

The movement of "Gottglaubige" or "Godbelievers" has issued a new catechism in Germany which makes it clear that for this religion, race and God are identical. Some of the questions and answers are:

"How do we know there is a Divinity?"

- (a) "From the existence of our people. While the individual is born and dies the people remains. The people is eternal according to human judgment. Its eternity is derived from its bloodstream. In the bloodstream of a people is contained the mysterious force from which new life continually develops. This force that gives Life is the Divinity."
- (b) "From the existence of nature and the evolution of life. The ordered change in the Seasons, the

fixed courses of the stars, high and low tides, the regular succession of day and night testify in forcible manner to the work of that same eternal force which we discover in the coursing of our blood, in the birth and death of beings."

"Is there a Moral Law for Man?"

"Yes, it is two-fold. An unwritten one in our blood and the written one of human society. The unwritten moral law is the voice of our blood and, the blood being the seat of the divine source of life, the voice is a divine voice. (Natural law.) The written social law has grown out of ancient customs. German law today is the written law arising from the moral exigencies of our blood, of our race."

"What are the relations between a German 'believer' and Christianity?"

"He has a religious belief and has no need of that of other peoples. For him the revelation offered by nature and the people, the duties that devolve upon him from his blood, and the conviction that he survives in his people, is enough. Christianity can offer to the believer in God nothing that can give him a greater conviction, a stronger force, and a better support. We cannot find that Christianity has helped the German people. On the contrary our people have been ruined by Christ and the priests. Only a return to our ancient beliefs has made us free again. We have no need of Christianity for the salvation of our people."

Lay Readers in German Churches

The mobilization of pastors and the shrinkage of theological students in Germany are beginning to lead to a serious situation in the churches. During the past year only 400 young men were studying for the ministry, whereas the usual number has been 2500. For this reason lay people are being enlisted and trained throughout Germany to conduct religious services. The Church authorities of Hanover are seeking to secure lay leadership for catechetical instruction as well as for church services.

The Germans and the Orthodox Church

The German conquest of the Balkans faces the Nazis with a new problem, the intransigence of the Orthodox Church. The Orthodox Church may well be criticized for its too intimate relation with the political life of the respective nations in which it is dominant. But in times when political freedom is destroyed, it becomes a remarkable residuary legatee of the destroyed nation.

The influence of the Yugoslav Patriarch Gavrilov upon the political events which led to the enthronement of young King Alexander is well known. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Nazis have imprisoned the Patriarch and that his imprisonment embarrasses them in securing the compliance of the nation.

In Greece the government set up by the Nazis was unable to persuade any member of the hierarchy of the

Greek Orthodox Church to administer the oath. It was forced finally to fall back upon an obscure Archimandrite to perform this service, with resultant loss of prestige.

Former Ambassador Supports Petain

Monsieur Paul Claudel, who is known as a Catholic poet and a former French ambassador to Washington, has given Marshal Petain strong support of the kind which reveals Catholic thought at its weakest. He declared: "Like all good Frenchmen, I cannot but feel delighted at the cleaning up carried out with magnificent foresight by Marshal Petain. Freemasonry, alcoholism, divorce, anti-christianism, sectarian education and professional parliamentarianism were France's scourges, and it is to be hoped that she is well rid of them. Today the place has been cleared for the work of reconstruction. There is no reason for doubting that the country's trusted leader will give it a political and social constitution adapted to its genius, its needs, its dignity and traditions."

Paris Orthodox Faculty Suppressed

The German authorities have closed the Russian Theological Faculty of Paris, best known of all orthodox seminaries in exile. This faculty has been supported particularly by funds drawn from Anglican friends of the orthodox movement and is known in America especially through the fact that Nicolai Berdyaev is a professor of this faculty. Berdyaev refused to leave his books and manuscripts to come to America and is reported to be lying dangerously ill in Paris.

Reformed Synod Meets in France

The National Synod of the Reformed Church of France met in Ales from May 6th to the 8th. The message to the churches adopted by the synod declares:

"A year has gone by since we were thrown into a world of distress and anxiety by the new invasion of our country. The Reformed Church of France is today cut into three sections by the consequences of the Armistice. Our brotherly sympathy and fervent prayers have been extended throughout the meeting of our Synod to the Church of the captivity constituted by our prisoners and the Church of the occupied zone. Of the eight districts of our Church in the occupied zone, only three representatives were able to join with us. Their presence has been a grace of God, a valuable help, and a great joy.

"In our great weakness, we have asked God to show us what He expects of our Church in our country which is sorely wounded but determined to rise again and live. If disaster has forced us during the last few months to examine ourselves and measure our personal responsibilities as Frenchmen and Christians, it has strengthened our conviction, which has so often been expressed in the course of recent years, that the Church of Jesus Christ is engaged in a great struggle against the Power of Darkness which is more than ever at work in the souls of men and in the world. In face of all the contemporary paganism, the Church, which without distinction of race or of nation is based on the Revelation which God gives

CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
601 West 120th Street, New York, N. Y.

\$1.50 per year

10 cents per copy

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR
Chairman
JOHN C. BENNETT
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM
JOHN A. MACKAY

RHODA E. McCULLOCH
FRANCIS P. MILLER
EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

it in the Old and New Testaments, must more than ever ask for grace to persevere in the obedience of faith.

"Holy Scripture calls us to pray for those who exercise authority in the State. In the suffering and uncertainty of today, we must constantly present to God the Chief of State and those who with him bear the responsibility for the destiny of France, that God may clothe them with wisdom and courage, beseeching Him that their work may prepare for our country a future of independence, justice, and peace. And each one of us, in carrying out his own task or vocation, must by the witness and influence of his Christian life be an ever-active force in the great work of the spiritual and moral renewal of France."

Toronto Ecumenical Conference

The first North American Ecumenical Conference was held in Toronto from June third to June fifth. Over two hundred delegates, mostly from the United States and Canada, were in attendance. The purpose of the Conference was not to reconsider the problems of Oxford, but to advance the ecumenical task within the presuppositions laid down by the Oxford Conference. Naturally the war issue occupied the attention of the delegates to a considerable degree, though it was not actually on the agenda. Dr. Silcox, one of the Canadian leaders, declared that there was a danger that the churches of the two nations were drawing apart just as the two nations were drawing more closely together.

The Canadian churchmen were practically unanimous in support of their Government's position on international relations, while the American delegation revealed the division on the war issue which is apparent everywhere. It was remarkable, however, that the pacifists and interventionists found a common ground in their emphasis upon a just peace. Dr. Sisco, the General Secretary of the United Church of Canada, and Dr. John Mackay, President of Princeton Theological Seminary, both non-pacifists, emphasized both the necessity of de-

feating tyranny and the urgency of giving the democratic cause a positive content. The address on war aims by Foreign Minister Anthony Eden was condemned explicitly and implicitly by several speakers.

Dr. Sisco probably expressed the sentiments of the vast majority of the delegates on the war in these words:

"This war which has engulfed us in its savage fury is not a conflict of black against white, Christ against the devil, good against evil, with no blurred edges or twilight zones. This was is the culmination of a vast complexity of sin and selfishness and utter stupidity for which all of us in varying degrees are responsible. But this should not be said in a way or in a manner that comes perilously near to being unsound. There is a moral issue at stake in this conflict the outcome of which will affect civilization for generations to come. For if Hitler and his legions have their way, Christianity in Europe will be driven underground and this American continent will have to orient its life toward militarism in apprehension of the future. The issue is moral in that it is a struggle to maintain if possible an order of society which promises free course to the gospel of Christ and holds out renewed hope for an international order based on the sanctity of law and approximating justice. It is for that reason that the Christian Churches in Canada have given their moral support to the Canadian government."

Norwegian Pagans

The Quisling party in Norway, which represents two per cent of the population, is seeking to follow its German masters by reviving Nordic paganism. The Quisling youth organization has reinstated the old sun festival of a thousand years ago. Stories of Norwegian history and saga are being woven into the new ritual.

At the same time the Quisling group is organizing the Christians who adhere to its policy into a special group which has adopted the slogan "For God, Quisling and Fatherland." The first congress of this group took place in Oslo at the end of March.

Despite all these efforts Quisling has failed so obviously in winning the Norwegians that the Germans are ruling the country increasingly without Quisling's aid.

In our next issue we shall print an important article on the situation in India. The author of the article is the Very Reverend Arthur W. Davies, Dean of Worcester. Dr. Davies has long been connected with the World Christian Movement and the World Student Federation. He was a missionary in India for twenty years and was Vice-Chancellor of Agra University in India. He returned to England in 1929 as Secretary of the Missionary Council of the National Assembly of the Church of England. He has been Dean of Worcester since 1934 and has revisited India twice, once as a member of the Lindsay Commission, and again to attend the Madras Conference.

Public Library
Woodward & Kirby Aves.
Detroit, Mich.

650 12-41

